DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 827 HE 001 488

TITLE Survey of University Policies Relating to Student Life. Initial Report.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Div. of Educational Programs and Research.
PUB DATE [70]
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
DESCRIPTORS Activism, *Administrative Policy, Governance, *Higher Education, *Policy, *Student Behavior, Student Participation, *Students, Universities

ABSTRACT

This report contains the results of a survey conducted by the Division of Educational Programs and Research of Michigan State University that attempted to obtain specific information concerning the policies of other large universities on issues relating to student life. Questions were asked on (1) student participation in academic governance, (2) alcoholic beverages, (3) student disturbances and demonstrations, (4) open house (room visitation), (5) dress regulations, (6) off-campus housing, (7) hours for women students, (8) operation of automobiles on campus, and (9) standards of publication and distribution of printed material on campus. The questionnaires were sent to 110 universities with enrollments of 11,000 and over. Sixty nine schools or 63 percent responded. A list of the participating schools and the composite results of the questionnaire are included in the report. (AF)

ED039827

SURVEY OF UNIVERSITY POLICIES RELATING TO STUDENT LIFE -- INITIAL REPORT

I. PURPOSE

The Survey of University Policies Relating to Student Life was developed by the Division of Educational Programs and Research, Office of the Dean of Students, at Michigan State University. The primary purpose of the survey was to provide the Division of Educational Programs with specific, descriptive data concerning the policies of other large colleges and universities which relate to nine areas of interest to the student personnel staff at Michigan State. Those areas include: (1) Student Participation in Academic Governance; (2) Alcoholic Beverages; (3) Student Disturbances and Demonstrations; (4) Open House (Room Visitation); (5) Dress Regulations; (6) Off-Campus Housing; (7) Hours for Women Students; (8) Operation of Automobiles on Campus; (9) Standards of Publication and Distribution of Printed Material on Campus.

In addition, the Division planned to utilize the collected data as a basis for comparing the policies of other large schools to the policies of Michigan State. The survey was designed to determine if significant policy changes in the areas of concern are in the offing at any number of the responding schools. Finally, it was hoped that several generalizations about the direction of policy emphasis regarding these topics could be made, based upon this and earlier, similar studies.

This initial report presents a relatively thorough description of the results that have been compiled to date. Where appropriate, some inter-item comparisons have been made to attempt to identify policy consistency within a given university.

Frequently reports of this type receive a reaction similar to the following: "Now that you have collected all of this data, of what use is it, particularly since I already know the trends that the study purports to identify?" Perhaps the most appropriate reply to that question is that during the policy revision process concerning these areas of interest, often loud pronouncements are made regarding the policy position of "our" school as compared to all other schools. This report provides a quantitative analysis of the policies under consideration as indicated by a significant number of colleges and universities who were selected on the basis of enrollment to participate in the survey. It is hoped that those who read the report will view it in its proper perspective and will not fall into the trap of seeing more in the report than is, in fact, there.

II. PROCEDURES

A. Questionnaire Development

Nine topical areas of concern to the student personnel staff at MSU were considered from various approaches, and one question with several specific responses was developed about each area. A concerted effort was made to provide enough latitude in each response to permit all the respondents an opportunity to check an answer that most closely represented the current policy position of their institution. Each answer to any given question was intended to be mutually exclusive of

HE001484

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

all other responses to that question. (After analyzing the results, this effort was clearly more successful on some items than on others.) In the letter of explanation which accompanied the questionnaire and on the questionnaire itself, the respondents were encouraged to explain in detail any specific responses which they felt did not adequately reflect the policy of their institution. Many respondents did return student handbooks and similar publications with the questionnaire. A list of special reports and "task force" reports which were received from the institutions is presented in Appendix L.

Most of the items were constructed in such a manner that each respondent was presented with a range of responses. These responses were arranged on a continuum from what the author termed a "traditional policy viewpoint" to a "progressive policy viewpoint." The former is defined as a policy position which reflects continuity with the past and is characterized by more conservative and restrictive policies. The "progressive policy viewpoint" is seen as a policy position which reflects a liberalization of university policies concerning student life, particularly when these policies are viewed in the light of the in loco parentis philosophy which has been very prevalent in the last several decades.

Each respondent was asked to indicate if his institution had conducted formal research on the policies under consideration and if those studies were available. Finally, each respondent was asked to indicate on each topic if his institution was planning to revise the policy which he had just described.

The questionnaire was designed to be completed by the Dean of Students, his equivalent, or one of his immediate associates, rather than by someone farther down the student personnel hierarchy within each institution. It was felt by the author that the principal staff members would be more likely to understand the "sense" of the policies than would part-time personnel or assistants to the assistants. To encourage this particular response, the letter of explanation was addressed to the "Dean of Students" and the emphasis in that letter was on the ease of response (a checklist response format--see Appendix A). The following table indicates the degree of success of this effort:

TABLE 1

CATEGORIES OF RESPONDENTS

	Position	Frequency
1.	Vice President For Student Affairs	5
2.	Dean of Students	17
3.	Associate Dean of Students	23
4.	Assistants to above 3 categories	8
5.	Director of Student Activities	4
6.	Graduate Assistants	2
7.	Miscellaneous	6
8.	No Response	2
	Total Number of Respondents	67

The first three categories listed above were considered to be in the preferred group of respondents. Approximately sixty-seven percent of the respondents can be

classified in the preferred group and the remainder are scattered throughout various offices within the student services division.

B. Sample Selection

The major criteria for the selection of the participating institutions was based upon total enrollment on any one campus of a given school. Enrollment figures were taken from the 1969-70 edition of Accredited Institutions of Higher Education, which was based upon Fall, 1968, enrollment. Because the study was primarily concerned with "large" institutions, a minimum cutoff figure of 15,000 students was established. In the actual sample selection process, this figure varied down to about 10,500 or 11,000 students as listed in AIHE, since the author was interested in obtaining a wide geographic representation.

One hundred and ten colleges and universities from thirty-eight states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico were sent the questionnaire with the accompanying letter of explanation. Of the 110, sixty-nine schools responded (63%), and sixty-seven questionnaires were used in the survey analysis.

An example of the letter of explanation and the questionnaire is attached as Appendix A. The list of respondents is attached as Appendix B. Individual item response breakdown is attached as Appendices C through K.

III. DISCUSSION

Question I-A (see Appendix C for complete question and response breakdown) was designed to determine the degree to which the policies of the responding institutions encouraged student participation on several of the influencial policy-making committees of the particular schools. Voting membership on the important committees was viewed as having more significance than ex officio membership. Either was viewed as being more important than having no opportunity to participate in policy discussions and decisions. Among the specific concerns of Item I-A was whether or not the students had an influencial voice in matters relating to curriculum development, faculty affairs and tenure, student life, and general educational policies such as grading procedures, class attendance, etc. Although important, membership on library committees, athletic committees, and similar boards and commissions was not considered to be a primary concern of this question.

A total of sixty-five institutions responded to Question I-A. Forty-seven (73%) of the respondents indicated that " . . . students are voting members . . . on policy committees . . . " at their respective institutions. Table 2, below, illustrates on which committees students were most frequently given voting representation.

TABLE 2

COMMITTEES ON WHICH STUDENT VOTING MEMBERSHIP IS MOST FREQUENTLY PERMITTED

Committee	Frequency (N=47)	Percent
1. Curriculum Committee	26	55%
2. (Faculty) Committee on Student Life	39	83%
3. Educational Policies Committee	23	49%
4. Faculty Affairs/Tenure Committee	2	4.5%
5. University Senate or Faculty Council	9	19%
6. "Most Policy Committees"	7	15%

As Table 2 illustrates, the committee most often checked as having student voting membership was the Committee on Student Life. In several instances, respondents noted that this committee was not seen as a faculty committee, but was frequently composed of students, faculty and administrators. In addition to the Curriculum Committee and the Educational Policies Committee, student membership was found on numerous other committees such as long-range planning committees and admissions committees. The remaining eighteen respondents to Item I-A indicated students had either ex officio membership (eleven respondents) or no membership (seven respondents).

An effort was made to determine the ratio of student members to faculty members on committees of the type described above; however, the results obtained varied so widely with the particular committees that meaningful comments cannot be made.

According to the response pattern of this question, it appears that a substantial majority of the respondents do encourage student participation on various influencial policy committees, particularly on those committees which are seen to directly influence student life. On the other hand, of the six respondents that indicated their schools did not permit student membership on the major policy committees, four schools stated that they were not planning to revise their present policy.

In reply to the question of possible policy revision, eleven schools indicated that such a revision was forthcoming. Ten of those eleven respondents already permitted students to vote on the influencial committees. Eighteen schools, or about twenty-eight percent of the total respondents, indicated that they were not planning to revise their policies and that they did not permit student voting membership on major policy-making committees.

With regard to Question II, the interest in policies relating to alcoholic beverages centered around two aspects of the topic. The first concern was determining if the respondents had a policy regulating the use of alcoholic beverages which was tailored to the unique university environment rather than merely reflecting accord with the local or state laws. The second concern developed from the initial one--that of determining where liquor consumption was permitted on and off the campus.

Two major difficulties arose when response analysis was begun. It became clear that "alcoholic beverages" did not connote the same thing to all of the respondents. In states where the legal drinking age for "hard liquor" was 21, it was often found that beer of the 3.2 variety was permitted at age 18. Therefore, beer became a specific exception to a general prohibitive regulation. For the purposes of this survey, beer was considered to be an alcoholic beverage and the permissibility of beer on campus was considered to be an affirmative response to the question. Caution should be exercised when generalizing about the results of this item.

A second difficulty that became apparent as the analysis proceeded was that the "off campus" versus "on campus" dichotomy became the intervening variable, rather than the type of living unit, in determining the role of the university in permitting liquor consumption. For example, fraternities, sororities and even residence halls that were located off campus might well have permitted the consumption of alcoholic beverages, while their counterparts living on campus were prohibited from doing so.

With these concerns in mind, several comments can be made about the responses that were received. Twenty-six (39%) of the sixty-six respondents indicated that alcoholic beverages (including beer) were prohibited anywhere on campus. Thirty-nine

(59%) indicated that alcoholic beverages (in some cases, only beer) were permitted in specific localities on campus. Table 3 illustrates the various areas where respondents indicated alcoholic beverages were permitted.

TABLE 3

LOCALITIES WHERE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES MAY BE CONSUMED

Location	Number (N=39)	Percent
1. Fraternity/Sorority Houses	26	67%
2. Married Housing	26	67%
3. Residence Halls	19	49%
4. Student Center/Union	13	33%
5. Approved Functions on Campus	16	41%
6. Approved Functions off Campus	23	59%

It is interesting to note that approximately sixty-seven percent of the respondents who indicated that alcoholic beverages were permitted on their campuses, stated the localities where consumption was permitted were fraternity and sorority houses and married housing. An explanation of these results as they pertain to fraternity and sorority houses may be that many of the greek letter houses, although they come under some type of university jurisdiction, are not on the campus proper or even on university-owned land and therefore are not subject to the same regulations as the on-campus residence halls. A similar interpretation can be made for the relatively large number of responses indicated for "approved functions off campus." Their occurrence off of the main campus may exclude them from the prohibitive regulations for activity on university property. Married student housing areas have generally been viewed as being occupied by graduate students, frequently with families, and older undergraduate students and have received less restrictive policy attention on many campuses.

Noting the increase in student activism on many campuses and particularly on the larger campuses in the last two or three years, the author's concern in Question III was with surveying the relative tolerance or acceptance by administrators of legitimate protest activity. Some difficulty was encountered in developing responses that successfully discriminated in degree of tolerance and this shortcoming was reflected in the analysis. Item III also was concerned with whether or not the respondents had developed specific emergency operating procedures in case the threat of record or equipment destruction existed as the result of an on-going demonstration.

In replying to the question, "Do you have a policy defining the position of your university with regard to student demonstrations and disturbances?", forty-four of the sixty-six respondents (67%) agreed that demonstrations were " . . . acceptable means of protest." The alternative choice, which received seven supporting responses, in the author's opinion, does not successfully discriminate between the policy position established in Response "1" and a policy indicating that demonstrations are not considered an acceptable means of protest. Generalizations with regard to these results should be made carefully.

It can be stated that a significant majority of the respondents do have specific policies concerning demonstrations and similar protest activity and that such activity is seen as legitimate, within limits, on the university scene.

With regard to the concern of the latter half of this item, forty-seven (71%) of the respondents stated that they did have " . . . a well-defined emergency operating procedure . . . in the event that certain buildings may be occupied and a possibility exists that important records may be destroyed." Unfortunately, the questionnaire did not attempt to determine the date at which these policies were developed, nor did it try to ascertain what the motivating forces were that led to policy development.

One of the traditional spheres of influence of student personnel administrators has been their control of the residence hall policies. The continuing direct influence of the student personnel staff with regard to policy making, particularly as it concerns room visitation privileges, was the central concern of Question IV. The issue of open house regulations was assessed with opportunities for response varying from unlimited visitation to no visitation privileges whatsoever. It was also assessed as it pertains to both men's living units and women's living units.

According to the sixty-seven schools which responded to this item, the very restrictive regulations typical of the early 1960's have almost totally vanished. They have been replaced by liberal policies permitting a significant amount of unsupervised room visitation. For example, fifty-seven (85%) of the respondents stated that room visitation by women is permitted in men's living units, subject to certain hours regulations. Eighty percent of the respondents indicated that room visitation by men was permitted in women's living units, subject to similar hours regulations. In areas where regulations do exist, they tend to be more frequently the product and the responsibility of residence hall governments or campus student governments than of the student personnel staff. Seven schools indicated room visitation by women in men's living units was not permitted, and six respondents indicated the same for women's living units.

Twenty-one schools indicated that they were planning to revise their current room visitation policy. Only one of those twenty-one did not already permit some type of room visitation.

Dress codes, though of little concern to most students and administrators on today's campuses, are still in existence at some colleges and universities. Item V of this survey was developed to determine the extent to which dress code policy development was considered a student personnel function. The range of response variation included no dress codes, codes defined by housing units on an individual basis, and codes defined for classrooms and/or other university activity by university regulation.

Surprisingly, fourteen of the sixty-seven respondents (21%) stated that some type of dress code was still in effect at their particular institution. Nine of these fourteen indicated that dress codes " . . . are in effect for campus living units and that . . . each housing unit defines its own (dress) policies regarding specific situations." Thirteen of these fourteen respondents indicated that they were not planning to revise their policies at the present time.

The role of the university with regard to student activities during the time the students are not on campus was the primary concern of Question VI. Included in this role was the university's active responsibility in exerting some type of influence towards off-campus housing establishments, primarily in the areas of fair rent practices, non-discriminatory practices, etc. An additional concern of this item was

the perceived university involvement in a disciplinary role when student violations of local laws also violated university policies. Although this question is closely related to the university's concept of discipline, it does not directly concern itself with the philosophy of the university-student relationship and the resulting actions of the university in discipline cases.

Sixty-seven schools responded to this item. The results of the survey are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT WITH OFF-CAMPUS HOUSING ESTABLISHMENTS

Degree of Involvement	Frequency (N=67)	Percent
1. "University insures all who rent to students subscribe to minimum standards."	18	27%
2. Only those who list with university must subscribe to minimum standards.	18	27%
3. University maintains disciplinary jurisdiction when local law and university policy are violated by same offense.	2	3%
4. University does not interact with off-campus housing establishments.	19	28%
5. Miscellaneous (no response, not applicable)	10	15%

As the table illustrates, thirty-six schools indicated that they were directly involved in insuring that off-campus housing establishments subscribed to practices of fair rent and non-discrimination. However, half of those respondents stipulated that their involvement was only with those schools who agreed to list their facilities with the university. Only two institutions stated that their policies " . . . maintained disciplinary jurisdiction over students involved in minor incidents in off-campus housing establishments."

Question VII, as Question IV, was concerned with the amount of control the university exercises over the students during the time the students are living on campus. The item was constructed in such a manner as to permit latitude in the primary response and to allow more specific factors to be indicated within the subordinate responses. Apparently, some difficulty or confusion developed on the part of some of the respondents when they considered their reply. Nine respondents answered both response "1" and response "2".

Response A "1" was constructed to reflect the most traditional policy in effect at the responding institutions. Schools which selected this response concurred with the statement that "all women students are required to be in their place of residence by specific hours each night." Specific considerations such as age, parental permission or special events may vary that time, but the granting of overnight visits, except for home visits on weekends, would not be permitted.

Response A "2" reflected a more permissive viewpoint in that some women students were permitted unrestricted hours while other identifiable groups were not permitted this privilege. The criteria for determining the groups were similar to those qualifying characteristics of Response A "1". The most permissive policy position defined by Question VII was presented in Response A "3", which placed no hours restrictions on any women students, regardless of age or class standing.

Table 5 presents the broad categories of responses that resulted for this item.

TABLE 5

UNIVERSITY POLICIES ON WOMEN'S HOURS

Policy	Number (N=66)	Percent
1. All women students must be in their place of residence by specific hours each night.	5	8%
2. Some women students are permitted unrestricted hours.	31	47%
3. All women students are permitted unrestricted hours.	17	26%
4. Miscellaneous (Both 1 and 2, no response)	13	19%

It appears from Table 5 that when these respondents are considered as a group, the principal policy trend in this area is away from the traditional and restrictive policies of the past. Approximately seventy-five percent of the respondents indicated that at least some of the women students had unrestricted hours privileges.

The most influential criteria for determining who is allowed to have unrestricted hours and who is not as indicated by the respondents were class standing (25 of the 31 respondents), age (14 of the 31), and parental permission (13 of the 31). Academic standing was not indicated to be a significant criteria for receiving unrestricted hours privileges. (See Appendix I.)

Looking for a moment at those five schools that do not permit any unrestricted hours for women students, four of them indicated that they were not planning any policy revisions in this area. On the other hand, nine of the schools that already had instituted some form of unrestricted hours policy were planning additional revisions, and it seems unlikely that those revisions will develop with a more conservative emphasis than is currently in effect.

It seemed reasonable to assume that schools with permissive policies in the area of dormitory closing hours may also reflect this policy outlook in other related policies. A comparison of the responses to the room visitation question (Item IV) and to this item was made. The consistency of responses is the primary concern.

Considering the thirty-one schools which indicated that some women do have unrestricted hours, twenty-four of those same schools also have room visitation policies which permit visitation in both men's and women's living areas. All of the schools

that indicated they have unrestricted hours for all women students (seventeen schools) also have room visitation policies similar to the type just described. Of those five schools that did not permit any unrestricted hours for women students, three allowed limited room visitation and two did not permit any visitation. There does appear to be a significant amount of consistency in the direction that would normally be expected, based upon the policy viewpoints outlined earlier in this paper.

Item VIII was developed to obtain some information about the manner in which various institutions cope with the large number of students' automobiles during the primary university operating hours. The uniqueness of each campus and the diverseness of the regulations regarding the operation and parking of automobiles on campus make generalizations difficult. It is possible, however, to determine if most or all students are allowed to bring their cars to campus and if they may operate them on the main campus.

Thirty-five (52%) of the sixty-seven institutions which replied to this question agreed that " . . . all students may operate automobiles on any campus street and may park in designated lots throughout the campus." Of the remaining thirty-two respondents, twenty-seven indicated more restrictive driving and parking regulations in effect at their institutions.

The last area of concern of this survey involved the amount of control the administration exercised over recognized student publications in terms of editorial content and general material selection and presentation. Differentiation in responses was made between strict control of and responsibility for content and simple recognition of student publications with no expressed concern for the content or for editorial policy.

Question IX-B provided the opportunity for the respondents to be more explicit in the type of concerns with which their policies relating to student publications dealt. Among these areas of concern were the use of the campus mail system, residence hall distribution procedures and policies concerning non-student publications. In addition, affirmative-negative responses were obtained regarding the existence of policies defining solicitation procedures and procedures regarding the publication of "underground" organizational newspapers.

Table 6 presents the number and percentage of the total group of respondents who responded to each alternative response.

TABLE 6

STANDARDS OF PUBLICATION FOR
STUDENT-ORIGINATED MATERIALS

Policy	Number (N=57)	Percent
1. Policy defines fixed responsibility . . . to prevent obscene, libelous materials from being published or distributed.	21	37%
2. Policy recognizes existence of student publications, but does not place responsibility.	19	33%
3. Institution does not control, in any way, student publications.	17	30%

From these results it can be inferred that most of these schools are not involved in direct supervision of campus publications; however, a majority of the respondents indicated the existence of policies which define procedures to be followed in distributing published materials. Of the sixty-four institutions responding, sixty-one replied affirmatively to the question, "Do you have a policy defining solicitation of subscriptions or contributions on campus?"

Appendix A

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY . East Lansing . 48823

Division of Research and Educational Programs...Office of the Dean of Students
155 Student Services Building

November 10, 1969

Dear Sir:

The Division of Research and Educational Programs, Office of the Dean of Students, Michigan State University, is currently revising policies relating to student conduct. It is our desire to gain a broader understanding of the policies regarding these issues which are in effect or in planning stages at other large universities so that we may draw upon your successful and unsuccessful experiences. The results of this institutional survey may be of interest to your personnel also.

We have developed a simple checklist questionnaire focusing upon the issues in which we are most interested. Your cooperation in taking a few moments to complete the accompanying checklist and to return it to this office will be appreciated. In addition, we would like to have copies of your policies and procedural statements related to these student personnel concerns, as well as the results of research and evaluation projects on these topics. Any additional comments that pertain to the issues in question are welcome.

When the results have been tabulated and a report compiled, we will be happy to forward a copy to those who have indicated an interest in the outcome.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest.

Sincerely yours,

James A. McCambridge
Graduate Research Assistant

Laurine E. Fitzgerald
Assistant Dean of Students
Director, Research and Educational Programs

APPENDIX B

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RESPONDING TO SURVEY
(and accompanying enrollment figures*)

*Enrollment figures refer to Fall, 1968 enrollment as indicated in the 1969-70 issue of Accredited Institutions of Higher Education.

1. Auburn University
   Auburn, Alabama
   14,222

2. Arizona State University
   Tempe, Arizona
   25,473

3. University of Arizona
   Tuscon, Arizona
   23,617

4. California State College
   at Long Beach
   Long Beach, California
   27,176

5. California State College
   at Los Angeles
   Los Angeles, California
   24,650

6. Fresno State College
   Fresno, California
   19,501

7. Sacramento State College
   Sacramento, California
   19,312

8. San Diego State College
   San Diego, California
   30,077

9. Stanford University
   Stanford, California
   11,428

10. University of California
    at Davis
    Davis, California
    11,388

11. University of Southern California
    Los Angeles, California
    18,972

12. Colorado State University
    Ft. Collins, Colorado
    15,361

13. University of Colorado
    Boulder, Colorado
    29,250

14. University of Connecticut
    Storrs, Connecticut
    17,130

15. University of Delaware
    Newark, Delaware
    13,063

16. American University
    Massachusetts & Nebraska Aves.
    Washington, D.C.
    14,981

17. George Washington University
    Washington, D.C.
    19,073

18. University of Florida
    Gainesville, Florida
    19,848

19. University of Miami
    Coral Gables, Florida
    14,723

20. University of South Florida
    Tampa, Florida
    13,752

Questionnaire returned to late to be included in analysis.

21. University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
21,182

22. Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois
13,671

23. Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois
13,548

24. Northern Illinois University
Dekalb, Illinois
22,728

25. Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
16,734

26. Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana
16,602

27. Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
52,101

28. Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana
36,102

29. Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
18,083

30. University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa
19,506

31. Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas
12,570

32. University of Kansas
Lawerence, Kansas
17,790

33. University of Maine
Orono, Maine
13,571

34. Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
15,198

35. University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts
20,111

36. Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan
13,419

37. Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan
19,235

38. University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan
38,201

39. University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska
20,064

40. Fairleigh Dickinson University
Rutherford, New Jersey
26,057

41. Rutgers-The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey
26,057

42. University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
14,440

¢ 43. Hunter College of City
University of New York
New York, New York
18,350

44. Queens' College of City
University of New York
Flushing, New York
23,135

45. Cornell University
Ithaca, New York
15,049

¢ Questionnaires returned without completion.

46. State University of New York
at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York
19,113

47. North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina
11,812

48. University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
16,233

49. Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio
27,215

50. Ohio University
Athens, Ohio
22,217

¢ 51. Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
45,262

52. University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio
30,917

53. University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio
13,022

54. Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
18,936

55. Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon
14,474

56. University of Oregon
Eugene; Oregon
14,761

57. Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania
43,612

58. University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
17,770

59. University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
27,259

60. University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
14,314

61. Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee
16,637

62. University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee
30,875

63. University of Houston
Houston, Texas
23,713

64. University of Texas
Austin, Texas
53,468

65. Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah
23,598

66. University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
18,964

67. University of Washington
Seattle, Washington
31,913

68. West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia
16,544

69. University of Wisconsin, Madison
Madison, Wisconsin
34,670

¢ Questionnaire returned to late to be included in analysis.

APPENDIX C

I. Student Participation in Academic Governance

A. Do you have a policy permitting student participation in the overall academic governing of your institution (not college or departmental)?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 65

47 1. Yes. Students are voting members on several academic governing committees which define university policy that influences campus life. Check those committees on which students as well as faculty have voting power.

- 26 a. Curriculum Committee
- 2 b. Faculty Affairs/Tenure Committee
- 39 c. (Faculty) Committee on Student Life
- 23 d. Educational Policies Committee

e. Other

- 9 e1. University Senate or Faculty Council
- 7 e2. "Most Policy Committees"
- 6 e3. Discipline Committee
- 4 e4. Long Range Planning Committees
- 3 e5. Admissions and Academic Standards Committee
- 1 ea. e6. Financial Aids, University Residence Life, Athletics, Library, Arts

11 2. Yes. Students may participate in most committees of the type described above, but they do not have voting power on the committees.

6 3. No. Student membership on committees of the type described is not permitted.

1 4. Not applicable.

A1 (a). What is the ratio of students to faculty members on these committees?

- 7 a. 1:1
- 3 b. 1:2
- 6 c. 1:3
- 3 d. 1:4
- 28 e. Varies

B. Are you currently planning to revise this policy?

- 11 a. Yes
- 31 b. No
- 6 c. Continually under Review
- 19 d. No Response

APPENDIX D

II. Alcoholic Beverages

A. Do you have a policy regulating the possession, serving or consumption of alcoholic beverages on institution property or at institution-sponsored functions?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 66

26 1. Yes. Regulations prohibit the possession, serving or consumption of alcoholic beverages by any person in or on any university-owned property and in any housing facility under university jurisdiction on or off campus as well as at university-approved functions.

39 2. Yes. Regulations permit the possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages by any person who meets minimum state law requirements. Consumption is permitted in the following locations or situations: (Check if permitted)

19 a. Residence halls or similar living units
26 b. Fraternity/sorority houses
26 c. Married housing
13 d. Student Center or union
- 0 e. Classrooms
16 f. University-approved functions on campus
23 g. University-approved functions off campus
2 h. Other: Fieldhouse, Conference Center

1 3. No policy exists on this topic at this institution.

B. Are you currently planning to revise this policy?

18 a. Yes
35 b. No
14 c. No Response

APPENDIX E

III. Student Demonstrations and Disturbances

A. Do you have a policy defining the position of the university with regard to student demonstrations and/or disturbances?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 66

44 1. Yes. Demonstrations of a non-violent nature (sit-ins, pickets, marches) are considered to be acceptable means of protest on campus, providing they do not infringe on the rights of non-participants.

7 2. Yes. Unauthorized demonstrations are not approved by the university and participants are subject to disciplinary action.

1 3. No policy exists on this topic at the present time.

13 4. Both Response "1" and Response "2".

1 5. No Response

B. Do you have a well-defined emergency operating procedure specifying individual responsibilities and actions in the event certain buildings may be occupied and a possibility exists that important records or equipment may be damaged or destroyed?

47 1. Yes

14 2. No

5 3. No Response

C. Are you currently planning to revise this policy?

6 1. Yes

50 2. No

11 3. No Response

IV. Open House (Room Visitation) Policy

A. Do you have an open house (room visitation) policy in effect in men's living units?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 67

6* 1. Yes. Visitation by women is permitted at any time for unspecified periods.

51 2. Yes, but visitation is limited to specific hours of the day and/or days of the week.

7 3. Room visitation by women is not permitted at any time.

1 4. No policy exists on this topic at this institution.

1 5. Not applicable (no resident students).

1 6. No Response.

B. Do you have an open house (room visitation) policy in effect in women's living units?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 65

3* 1. Yes. Visitation by men is permitted at any time for unspecified periods.

49 2. Yes, but visitation is limited to specific hours of the day and/or days of the week.

6 3. Room visitation by men is not permitted at any time.

3 4. No policy exists on this topic at this institution.

2 5. No Reply.

2. 6. Not Applicable.

C. Are you currently planning to revise this policy?

23 1. Yes (1 respondent of the 23 did not permit room visitation).

39 2. No (5 respondents of the 39 did not permit room visitation).

5 3. No Response.

*As determined by student government or residence hall association.

APPENDIX G

V. Dress Regulations

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 67

A. Do you have a policy defining certain standards of dress on campus?

52 1. No. With regard to matters of dress, it is assumed that each student will exercise his own judgment.

9 2. Yes. Dress regulations are in effect for campus living units, however, each housing unit defines its own policies regarding specific situations.

5 3. Yes. Standards of dress for classrooms and/or other university activities are defined by regulation.

1 4. No Response

B. Are you currently planning to revise this policy?

0 1. Yes

56 2. No

11 3. No Response

APPENDIX H

VI. Off-Campus Housing

A. Do you have a policy defining the institution's relationship to off-campus housing establishments (excludes fraternities, sororities and co-op houses under university supervision)?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 67

18 1. Yes. The university insures that all establishments who agree to rent to students subscribe to specific standards of non-discrimination, fair rent practices and all other stipulations of local housing regulations.

2 2. Yes. The university maintains disciplinary jurisdiction over students involved in minor incidents in off-campus housing complexes that may violate local laws as well as university regulations, rather than permitting law enforcement officials to process the offenses through local courts.

19 3. No. The university assumes no obligation to interact in any way with off-campus housing establishments.

18 4. Those who list with the university are subject to regulations, primarily stipulations of non-discriminatory practices.

4 5. Both Response "1" and Response "2"

6 6. Other: (one response each) "Just rescinded policy of involvement"; looking for increased involvement; no response; not applicable; "limited approved housing available".

B. Are you currently planning to revise this policy?

8 1. Yes.

48 2. No

11 3. No Response

APPENDIX I

VII. Hours for Women Students

A. Do you have a policy defining specific hours with which women students living in university-supervised housing must comply?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 66

5 1. Yes. All women students are required to be in their places of residence by specific hours each night; however, these hours may vary depending upon one or all of the following considerations (these do not extend to overnight permission):

2	a. Age	5	d. Day of the week
3	b. Class Standing	4	e. Special Events
2	c. Academic Standing	4	f. Parental Permission

A (1) Are you currently planning to revise this policy? (n = 5)

1	a. Yes
3	b. No
1	c. No Response

31 2. Yes. Some women are not permitted unrestricted hours. The determining factors of eligibility may include one or all of the following:

14	a. Age	4	c. Academic Standing
25	b. Class Standing	13	d. Parental Permission

A (2) Are you currently planning to revise this policy? (n = 31)

9	a. Yes
21	b. No
1	c. No Response

17 3. Yes. All women students may determine the time at which they choose to return to their residence hall, if they choose to return at all.

A (3) Are you currently planning to revise this policy? (n = 17)

1	a. Yes
15	b. No
1	c. No Response

2 4. No policy exists on this topic at this institution.

9 5. Both Response "1" and Response "2".

2 6. No Response; Not applicable

APPENDIX J

VIII. Operation and Parking of Automobiles on Campus

A. Do you have a policy defining the operation and parking restrictions on campus by students during the primary operating hours of the university Monday thru Friday?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 67

10 1. Yes. No student may operate an automobile on any campus street or park it on any lot or space (except for residence hall lots or commuter lots) during regular operating hours. If graduate students are given special consideration, please check. 4

17 2. Certain identifiable groups (freshmen, students under 21) may not operate an automobile on campus; however, other students are permitted to do so.

35 3. Yes. All students are permitted to operate automobiles at any time on campus and may park in designated lots or spaces throughout the campus.

1 4. Both Response "1" and Response "2".

4 5. Other: (one response each) Assigned by student-staff committees; student government officers may park; handicapped may park.

B. Are you currently planning to revise this policy?

10 1. Yes

43 2. No

14 3. No Response

APPENDIX K

IX. Standards of Publication and Distribution of Printed Materials on Campus

A. Do you have a policy establishing guidelines for materials published and distributed by recognized campus organizations?

TOTAL NUMBER RESPONDING = 57

21 1. Yes. The policy defines fixed responsibility for supervising the content of published materials to insure that the materials are not obscene, libelous or do not advocate organized violence.

19 2. Yes. Present policy recognizes the existence of student publications, but it does not place responsibility for the content of the material.

17 3. No. The institution does not control in any way the publications of university-recognized organizations.

B. With regard to the distribution of printed matter on campus, do you have a policy specifying any or all of the following:

	Yes	No
1. Type of Material to be distributed	29	25
2. Use of Campus mail system	52	8
3. Procedures for residence hall distribution	57	7
4. Locations on campus where materials may be posted	57	6
5. Non-student publications	37	20

C. Do you have a policy defining solicitation of subscriptions or contributions on campus? (n = 64)

61 1. Yes
3 2. No

D. Do you have specific provisions concerning the publication or distribution of materials produced by "underground" or non-recognized organizations? (n = 59)

12 1. Yes
47 2. No

D. Are you currently planning to revise this policy?

10 1. Yes
43 2. No
14 3. No Response

APPENDIX L

Special policy reports and "task force" reports were received from a number of institutions. Those reports are listed below. If you want a copy of a specific report, please contact the originating institutions.

1.	Indiana State University	Faculty-Student Committee statement. Statement on Use of University Facilities.
2.	Kansas State University	Report of Committee on Student Involvement. Report of Task Force on University Governance.
3.	North Carolina State University	Report on Student Participation in Academic Governance.
4.	Queens' College, City University of New York	Governance Report
5.	University of Miami (Florida)	Survey of University Committees with Student Membership.
6.	University of North Carolina	University Statement on Honor System, Alcoholic Beverages, Room Visitation, Disruptive Conduct.
7.	University of Oregon	Report on Student Conduct.
8.	University of Southern California	Report of the Committee on Student Behavior.
9.	University of Wisconsin at Madison	Report on Campus Faculty Committee Composition. Report on University Housing Policy. Resolution on Student Discipline.